SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BUNDLED NONTAXABLE SOFTWARE

42 Counties Responding to Questionnaire As of August 4, 2013

	1. Have adjustments been made to remove bundled nontaxable software from the cost of machinery and equipment in your county?							
	Yes. If you, please provide responses to questions 2 through 9.							
	18 Counties							
	No. If no, please provide responses to questions 8 and 9.							
	24 Counties							
2. Ho	ow did you become aware that an adjustment was necessary?							
	Taxpayer Notified the Assessor before Business Property Statement was filed							
	2 Counties							
	Duainaga Duanauty Statement							
	Business Property Statement							
	5 Counties							
	Property Tax Audit							
	10 Counties							
	Assessment Appeal Filed							
	13 Counties							
	Other (Please Explain)							
	Comment: Agents bring up issue; hard to separate the value reduction to software only when agent is requesting reduction.							
3. W	hat type of documentation was used to support the adjustment (mark all that apply)?							
	Study conducted or data collected by your office.							
	3 Counties							
	Study or data provided by a taxpayer.							
	6 Counties							
	Invoice							
	9 Counties							

		Manufacturer or vendor provided a breakdown in costs concerning one or more of the following: hardware, basic operational software, operational software, and/or application software.
		8 Counties
		Other (Please Explain)
		Comment: Deloitte study for Set Top Boxes Comment: Letters from vendors were rejected by assessor but accepted by AAB Comment: Questionable cost breakdown provided Comment: Vendor provided a % of software to hardware letter Comment: Spreadsheet summary of company quote Comment: Stipulation by taxpayer; assessor conducted field inspection Comment: Consulted with other counties
4.	Hov	w was the adjustment calculated (mark all that apply)?
		Percentage of the total cost of the equipment? If this adjustment was used, please describe the equipment and identify the percentage used.
		Comment: taxpayer asked for 45% to 50%; taxpayer accepted county offered 10% Comment: MRI machine - 30% Comment: 15%-30% for medical equipment, plus warranty and training costs of 5% Comment: 20% est full cash value reduction was agreed and included 16% nonassessable software, 4% est warranty and training costs Comment: High-tech medical including MRI units – 35%
		Cost on invoice?
		6 Counties
		Cost based on breakdown provided by manufacturer or vendor? 5 Counties
		Other (Please Describe)
		Comment: MRI machine 30% rejected by assessor but accepted by AAB Comment: Cost/breakdown provided by manufacturer; average % applied Comment: Internet information provided by taxpayer Comment: Tried to verify amount through manufacturer; applied reduced trade level to account for software Comment: Estimated %; 20% to 30% depending on make, model, and year

5. Please complete the following table with respect to the number of assessment appeals filed in your county due to bundled nontaxable software.

Year	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
Appeals Filed	3	2	20	20	1	1
	8	27	1	1	20	4
	33	20	1	32	1	3
	5	1	121	9	54	1
	73	76	21	22+	1	13
	20+	14	42+	2	13	2
	6	1	11	7	20+	8
	110	20+	4	2	10	3
	1	8	5	1	3	1
	5	15	1		1	
	5	7				
	1	1				
	270	192	227	96	124	36

OUTCOME/STATUS OF APPEALS

Year	2012-13	2011	1-12	2010	0-11	200	9-10	200	8-09	200	7-08
Pending/Unresolved	3		2		16		9		1		1
_	8		25		21		2		10		7
	33		22		11		5		3		3
	5		14		2		2				
	73		1		5						
	20+		20+								
	6		8								
	110		15								
	1		7								
	5										
	5										
	1										
	270	114		55		18		14		11	
Withdrawn			2		1		8		7		3
			1		15		5				2
			16		7						
		19		23		13		7		5	
Stipulated			20		20		20		1		1
			38		1		1		20		13
			1		85		12		1		1
					2		2		54		
					1		2		13		
							1		1		
		59		109		38		90		15	
Hearings Before the					4		12		14		1
Appeals Board					31		14				
							2				
				35		28		14		1	

OUTCOME OF HEARINGS BEFORE THE APPEALS BOARD

Year	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
Assessments Reduced	1	1	4	12	1	1
			30	13	13	4
			1	1	1	13
						1
	1	1	35	26	15	19
Assessments Upheld			1			
_			1			
Assessments Increased			3	14	14	1
			1			
			4	14	14	1

6. Use the following table to identify the type of industry where adjustments were made to remove bundled nontaxable software (BNTS) from the cost of machinery and equipment. If available, include adjustment information, year of adjustment, and source used to identify the necessary adjustment.

		Total Assessed	Adjustment to	Net Assessed		
No.	Industry	Value	Remove BNTS	Value	Year ¹	Source ²
1.	Medical	\$3.4 million	<50K		A	2
2.	Leased Heath Care	\$557,370	Table Provided	\$198,152	E	4
3.	Leased Heath Care	\$339,340	Table Provided	\$120,666	\mathbf{F}	4
4.	MRI		\$166,192		A	1
5.	MRI		\$213,676		В	1
6.	MRI		\$206,520		C	3
7.	MRI		\$247,087		D	3
8.	MRI		\$510,993		E	3
9.	MRI		\$955,911		F	5
10.	Small Adjmts to PCs					
11.	Medical/Hospital				A	
12.	Medical/Hospital	\$8,600,334	\$2,688,091	\$5,912,243	В	4
13.	Medical/Hospital	\$47,139,538	\$14,126,516	\$33,013,022	C	3,4,5
14.	Medical/Hospital	\$46,540,370	\$13,699,072	\$32,841,298	D	3,4,5,6
15.	Medical/Hospital	\$29,127,780	\$9,971,290	\$19,156,490	E	4,5,6
16.	Medical/Hospital	\$23,541,947	\$8,213,630	\$15,328,317	F	4
17.	Medical/Hospital	\$4,186,139	\$1,106,984	\$3,079,155	G	4
18.	Medical					
19.	Medical Equipment	\$3,376,709	\$885,125	\$2,491,584	E	4
20.	Medical Equipment	\$18,497,551	\$6,121,706	\$12,375,845	F	4
21.	Medical (MRI/CT)		20% - 30%		B/C	4,1
22.	Medical (dialysis)	\$2.3 million est	30%		E	5,1
23.	Medical (dialysis)	\$1.7 million est	20%		D	5,1
24.	Medical (dialysis)		0%		C	5,1
25.	Medical	\$942,858	\$188,572	\$754,286	В	3
26.	High Tech Medical	\$185,000	\$47,000	\$138,000	C	2
27.	Medical-Cardinal					
28.	Dialysis	\$2,110,189			Н	
29.	Dialysis	\$2,202,910			G	
30.	Dialysis	\$2,211,102			F	
31.	Dialysis	\$3,488,190			E	
32.	Dialysis	\$2,658,992			D	

		Total Assessed	Adjustment to	Net Assessed		
No.	Industry	Value	Remove BNTS	Value	Year ¹	Source ²
33.	Dialysis	\$7,181,474			C	
34.	Dialysis	\$6,378,544			В	
35.	Dialysis	\$3,764,160			A	
36.	Theater Proj Equip	\$197,552	\$36,520	\$161,032	A	1

¹ Use the following codes to identify the roll year: **A** for 2012-2013; **B** for 2011-2012; **C** for 2010-2011; **D** for 2009-2010; **E** for 2008-09; and **F** for 2007-08.

Source: Other

No.	Description of "Other" Source
12	BPP resulting from prior year appeal – prior to audit
14	BPP resulting from prior year appeal – prior to audit
21	The value and adjustment estimated; software not isolated issue just a part of appeal. AAB did not
	separate value as to issues such as software.

7.	Please indicate the number of cases concerning appeals of assessments in which the valuation
	of bundled nontaxable software, embedded software, Revenue and Taxation Code sections
	995 or 995.2, or Property Tax Rule 152 have been an issue since January 1, 2007.

No appeals have been filed with the appeals board.

4 Counties

Number of decisions that have been reached by the appeals board.

4 Counties – 9 decisions

Number of taxpayers who have filed for a refund. Please provide copies of each filing. For each appeal, please provide the evidence presented by the taxpayer and assessor.

4 Counties – 6 refund filings

Number of settlements that have been reached after the filing of a claim for refund.

5 Counties – 33 settlements

Number of cases that have been filed by the county or taxpayers in Superior Court challenging the valuation decision by an appeals board. Please provide copies of the complaint, answer, and evidence presented by the taxpayer and/or assessor and any decision by the Superior Court.

1 County – 1 filing

Number of appeals of any decision of the Superior Court. Please provide copies of all documents filed with the court of appeal.

1 County – 1 court decision

² Use the following codes to identify the source: **1** for Business Property Statement; **2** for Property Tax Audit; **3** for Assessment Appeals Withdrawn; **4** for Assessment Appeals Stipulated; **5** for Assessment Appeals Hearings with Board Reduced Values; and **6** for all Other (if "other," please complete the following table.

	Other (Please Explain
	Comment: 35 appeals but not enough evidence provided Comment: 2 appeals filed, but both withdrawn Comment: number of cases stipulated or settled before going to AAB: 2009=5, 2010=14, 2011=13, 2012=0 Comment: 51 appeals filed; none have been heard, stipulated, or resolved Comment: 5 appeals filed DIRECTV; postponed awaiting actions across the state Comment: 27 appeals filed since 2007; none have been heard yet.
8.	en conducting audits, have you found that taxpayers reported less than full cost of ipment due to bundled nontaxable software?
	No
	29 Counties
	Yes
	9 Counties
	If yes, how many instances were discovered in the last four years?
	6 Counties – 21 discoveries
	If yes, did they have evidence to substantiate their adjustment? Yes No
	No
	4 Counties
	Yes
	3 Counties
9.	re you received information/evidence from taxpayers requesting that bundled nontaxable ware be excluded from an assessment that you did not accept?
	No
	19 Counties
	Yes
	21 Counties
	If yes, please identify the taxpayer's documentation submitted as support for an adjustment and provide us with a copy of the information.
	Study or data provided by a taxpayer.
	6 Counties
	Invoice
	2 Counties

Manufacturer or vendor provided a breakdown in costs concerning one or more of the following: hardware, basic operational software, and application software, and/or application software.
3 Counties
Other (Please Explain)
Comment: Letters, memos, emails from agent with models of medical equipment
Comment: 1997 appeal by Sierra Pacific Industry; appeal ultimately dropped
Comment: Letters from vendors; undocumented opinions of tax agents
Comment: General opinion of taxpayer
Comment: Letters/invoices from taxpayer with breakdown by % for make/model
Comment: Quotes from vendor
Comment: % with no supporting evidence
Comment: Documentation prepared by agent with no verification
Comment: Letters from vendors; taxpayer spreadsheets with no support
Comment: Memo from manufacturer stating 30% of cost is software
Comment: Requests for deductions made on BPS and in appeal filings
Comment: Not accepted any claim for software because companies have not met Rule 152(f) requirements to supply acceptable information
Comment: Letter/email estimating % of software